DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 026 325 24 SP 002 174

By-Garrison, Jesse

Appendix T. Personalizing Teacher Education.

Northwest Regional Educational Lab., Portland, Oreg.
Spons Agency-Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.
Bureau No-BR-8-9022
Pub Date Oct 68
Contract-OEC-0-8-089022(010)
Note-9p.; Appendix T in A Compentency Based, Field Centered, Systems Approach to Elementary Teacher Education; Final Report. Vol. III, p165-174.
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$0.55
Descriptors-*Elementary School Teachers, Instructional Technology, Mental Health, *Personal Adjustment, *Program Development, *Self Concept, Self Evaluation, *Teacher Education, Teacher Role
Identifiers-*ComField Model Teacher Education Program

Two basic reasons compel a strong personalizing emphasis--a concern for the teacher-as-a-person--in the model teacher education program. Both are directly related to the "global objective" of providing for adaptive capabilities. The first reason derives from the already established mental health movement in our schools--the accepted responsibility for the personal and social development of students as well as the charge to develop intellectual abilities. The value of a focus on teacher self-definition, self-evaluation, and self-direction in providing for adaptive capabilities has received support from both clinical and educational sources. The second reason for concern comes from advances in the efficient acquisition of knowledge through the use of programed materials, particularly those mediated by computer. This is a trend that is gaining momentum and that will require increasing numbers of teachers being trained today to accept roles in education quite different from those of the past. These roles will emphasize the human factors in education that cannot be handled by machines. A model teacher education program should attend specifically to the conditions requisite to achieving a total individualization of education. (This document and SP 002 155-SP 002 180 comprise the appendixes for the ComField Model Teacher Education Program Specifications in SP 002 154.) (JS)

ED026325

APPENDIX T--PERSONALIZING TEACHER EDUCATION

Jesse Garrison

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Submitted for a Consortium of
Institutions and Agencies by the
Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory
400 Lindsay Building
710 S.W. Second Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97204

SP002174

PERSONALIZING TEACHER EDUCATION

Jesse Garrison

Introduction

Why include a concern for the teacher-as-a-person in the Model Teacher Education Program?

In brief summary I can say that there are at least two basic reasons that appear to me to compel a strong personalizing emphasis in our program. Both of them are directly related to our accepted "global objective" of providing for adaptive capabilities.

The first reason derives from the already established mental health movement in our schools. It is the conclusion of workers in this field that it is through a consideration of the self-concept that we can best provide for adaptive capabilities.

The second reason for concern for the teacher-as-a-person comes from advances in the efficient acquisition of knowledge through the use of programed materials, particularly those communicated with the aid of computer technology. This is a trend that is gaining momentum and that will require increasing numbers of the teachers being trained today to accept roles in education quite different from those of the past. These roles will emphasize the human factors in education that cannot be handled by machines.

The Mental Health Movement

At an unconscious level, the teaching profession has long accepted the responsibility for the personal and social development of students as well as the charge to develop intellectual abilities. With the tremendous increase in school populations, however, it has become increasingly difficult to discharge that responsibility. The result is now a more careful consideration of the needs.

Peck, Bown and Veldman (1964) clearly stated the problem when they observed that, "Through the hands of teachers pass all the children of America. If teachers could gain increases in understanding and skill in dealing with the mental health aspects of child learning and child development, their treatment of children in the course of their everyday teaching might help to correct or forestall some of the personality distortions which years later require scarce, expensive, and arduous treatment by a mental health specialist..." (p. 319)

Placing the key to mental health in children squarely in the hands of the teachers shifts the focus to an examination of the mental health of teachers. The unhappy conclusion that can be drawn from several sources is that teachers are clearly lacking as good models of mental health. (Which in turn probably means that these teaching teachers must be deficient also.)

The following examples compiled by Kaplan (1959) (slightly paraphrased here) will serve as evidence of the state of affairs:

A team of examiners, in 1942, under the direction of Dr. Emil Altman, chief medical examiner of the New York City schools, surveyed the adjustment of public school teachers in that city. Almost 4500 teachers were diagnosed as in need of psychiatric treatment; 1500 were classified as mental cases. All of these teachers were <u>in</u> the classroom at the time the study was made.

Boynton, through the use of an adjustment inventory, found that in a group of 1500 teachers, maladjustment ranged from 33 percent for teachers in the 46-50 year age group to 49 percent for teachers in the 16-25 year age group. Elementary school teachers, he found, had more problems of adjustment than did high school teachers.

Broxson used the Bell Adjustment Inventory with a group of 51 teachers and discovered that 35 percent of the group was emotionally maladjusted to a definite or serious degree.

Blair surveyed the mental health of 205 teachers using the Multiple Choice Rorschach Test. On the basis of this technique, he found that 9 percent of the teachers were seriously maladjusted.

Fenton's investigation of 241 teachers in California schools uncovered 22.5 percent who were suffering from psychoneuroses or other personality problems which required mental hygiene assistance. His interpretation of these findings was: "Evidence of personality difficulties in over one-fifth of the teachers in good school systems is sufficiently serious to make the mental hygiene of teachers a major obligation of school administrators and one which can no longer be neglected."

If the conclusion of serious maladjustment among significant numbers of teachers is warranted, the question then becomes clearly, "How can we develop high standards of mental health in teachers?"

FOSTERING MENTAL HEALTH IN TEACHERS

There appear to be at least three possible procedures open to assure the mental health competency of teachers:

1. Teacher education programs could adopt a policy of "test and select" in regard to personality factors. This would require the administration of a personality test battery to teacher education applicants and the establishment of cut-off scores for acceptance.

In my eyes anyone knowledgeable with personality tests should reject this suggestion immediately. For evidence supporting rejection, one needs go no further than a review of the standard reference work in the testing field; namely, the Mental Measurements Yearbooks compiled since 1938 by Oscar K. Buros. In Tests in Print: A Comprehensive Bibliography of Tests for Use in Education, Psychology, and Industry, Buros (1961) pleads with the user of his reference works to understand the nature of tests before using them in practical situations where test results could have a crucial effect on individual lives. He states that, "When we initiated critical test reviewing in the 1938 Yearbook we had no idea how difficult it would be to discourage the use of poorly constructed tests of unknown validity...counselors, personnel directors, psychologists and school administrators seem to have an unshakable will to believe the exaggerated claims of test authors and publishers. If these test users were better informed regarding the merits and limitations of their testing instruments, they would probably be less happy and less successful in their work.... The well informed test user...knows that the best of our tests are still highly fallible instruments which are extremely difficult to interpret with assurance in individual cases." (Introduction p. xxiii-iv)

Underscoring these remarks, and pertinent to our situation, is Buros' earlier introductory statement that of the total number of tests cited, "...The classification with the largest number of tests is 'Character and Personality'--the area in which assessment instruments have the least claim to validity...." (ibid. p. xix)

At this point in our understanding and assessment of personality, we cannot use tests as criterion measures of teacher effectiveness. The criterion is the performance of the teacher as reflected in the response of the students.

2. The second possible avenue for raising the standards of mental health in teachers is in establishing therapy facilities for teachers and teacher trainees.

Jersild, Lazar and Brodkin (1962) support the value of this approach by their report that important effects on the professional work of teachers have been realized through fairly intensive individual treatment. Peck and Richek (1967), however, comment on the Jersild investigation by noting that there was a lack of quantitative data supporting the effect of therapy; and more importantly, pointing out that there was a lack of evidence on the question of whether the teachers' "improved" mental health did contribute to the promotion of positive mental health in their pupils.

We can gain additional insight into the value of an extensive investment in therapeutive facilities for teacher trainees by reviewing the reports of four programs included in the Association for Student Teaching, Forty-Sixth Yearbook (1967). These were sponsored by the National Institute of Mental Health and carried out at Bank Street College, San Francisco State College, the University of Wisconsin and the University of Texas. The experience at the latter institution perhaps provides the clearest example. This demonstration program began in 1958 with two major aims: "To produce teachers who are healthy and mature, mentally and emotionally, so that their effect on pupils will maximize good mental health; and to give these teachers a systematic education in the facts, principles, and practices of good mental health. The point of view that emerged from this was that "...counseling could be effectively employed to undergird professional education by producing deeper and fuller awareness on the part of the prospective teacher of his own personality and his probable interaction with the realities of the teaching role. At the same time we conclude that counseling per se was certainly not the only, and probably far from the best, answer to this need. It cannot be relied upon as the exclusive vehicle for facilitating personal growth for all students...." (Peck, Bown and Veldman, p. 324-5)

In a concluding commentary on the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH) studies, Fred Wilhelms noted that all four of the studies moved toward an emphasis "on 'the person inside the teacher'...what that person genuinely <u>is</u>." (AST, 46th Yearbook, p. 240)

3. This leads us to a consideration of the third procedure that might be followed to promote high standards of mental health among teachers. This is one that uses a combination of tests <u>as</u>

tools (not as criteria) and principles drawn from current theories and practices of therapy to train teachers to assess their own strong and weak qualities relative to any particular teaching situation and thus to plan their own mode of adaptation to changing conditions.

The value of a focus on teacher self-definition, self-evaluation and self-direction has received recent support from both clinical and educational sources.

EVIDENCE FOR THE VALUE OF SELF-DEFINITION

In an effort to clarify the question, "What is psychopathology?" Millon (1967) makes these remarks: "...Clearly, mental disorders are expressed in a variety of ways; psychopathology is a complex phenomenon which can be viewed from many angles. On a behavioral level, for example, disorders could be conceived of as a complicated pattern of responses to environmental stress. Phenomenologically, they could be seen as expressions of personal discomfort and anguish. Approached from a physiological viewpoint, they could be interpreted as sequences of complex neural and chemical activity. Intrapsychically, they could be organized into unconscious processes that defend against anxiety and conflict." (p.2)

Millon goes on to point out that the question is not which of these viewpoints is correct, but which will serve best in a particular situation. After reviewing the experience of other researchers in the teacher education setting, the choice now seems quite clear. The first, stimulus-response approach, is simply unobtainable in a classroom. The third, physiological approach, demands an analysis by a type of specialist that is precluded in the school environment. The fourth, intrapsychic approach, utilizes complex hypothetical constructs to facilitate inferences by an expert clinician about the dynamic reactions of an individual to his present situation. Apart from an evaluation of the benefits of this approach, it must be recognized that there simply are not enough clinical personnel to make practical a program of intensive therapy for large numbers of student teachers. The second, phenomenological orientation, however, deals with indicators that can be recognized by the maladjusted person himself, i.e., the degree of distrubance is measured by the individual's own feelings of personal discomfort and anguish relative to a particular activity.

It is this phenomenological approach that I have taken as the basis for my own research in teacher education. This research will

be described later, but the essential aspect of this approach that needs to be clarified here is its reliance upon a method--a method that can enable an individual to reduce friction between himself and his environment whenever it arises.

SELF-DEFINITION IN PHENOMENOLOGICAL THERAPY

It used to be that psychologists argued endlessly about whether heredity or environment contributed most to an individual's behavior (particularly to his intellectual achievement). Now, "Because there is evidence to support both the hereditarian and the environmentalist point of view, most psychologists take a compromise position; namely, that heredity determines the limits of...potential and that environment determines how much of that potential will be developed...." (Lindgren, 1966, p. 254)

This interactive view in a teacher education program dictates that each individual must have some knowledge of, or means of discovering, first of all the limits of his adaptability, i.e., those things that are built into his structure which no external attempts to modify will alter. By college age, and by virtue of their accomplishments to date, it would seem that the hereditary aspects or limits of adaptability would be of little concern. It is undoubtedly true that we can assume a tremendous capacity for adaptation in our teacher trainees, but by college age each individual has, at least by habit if not by absolute hereditary necessity, built a self-structure that would be extremely difficult and unwise to try to change. If our teachers are deficient in mental health, it must be recognized that it is almost by definition the degree of inability to adapt that defines the degree of impairment in mental health. The phenomenological point of view is that in attempting therapy we must first discover those characteristics that the individual himself values most, i.e., that he sees as defining himself or setting his self apart from that of others.

The definition of self does not on the face of it seem to constitute a major task, yet the peculiar situation that is encountered over and over in therapy is that the individual is unable to define himself in an objective way. The lament of the maladjusted was poignantly expressed by the poet Robert Burns back in the 18th century in the following lines:

> "Oh wad some Power the giftie gie us
> To see oursels as ithers see us!
> It would frae many a blunder free us
> And foolish notion." (Benham, 1927)

The phenomenologists have demonstrated that once an individual is aware of the difficulty of viewing himself objectively--a difficulty inherent in the placement of the sensory organs in the human structure--he is more willing and able to utilize available techniques for objectifying his perceptions; in fact, he will be able to invent means of "seeing himself."

There are a number of techniques from psychology and education that can be used as tools for the individual to obtain an objective definition of himself. A list of these would include assessment tests, both conventional and projective; individual consultation, particularly in the client-centered style of Rogers (1959); role playing; sensitivity training; interaction analysis (see Amidon and Hough, 1967); micro-teaching (Stanford, 1967); and the repeated playback of performances recorded on audio and video tape (Jensen, 1966), etc.

Categories of information that the individual must make explicit through these techniques for a full definition of self, I have placed in the Self-Definition Chart which is described fully in the attachment on "General Adaptive Strategies."

SELF-EVALUATION AND SELF-DIRECTION

In phenomenological therapy, self-evaluation and self-determination are seen as but extensions of the efforts at self-definition.

Evaluation involves analysis of the effectiveness of the self in a particular situation. It is the point at which the teacher-trainee must make a decision as to whether he should, in the interests of realizing his own potential, enter the teaching profession. If he does, he can realize self-direction only by careful planning of a course of action that will make use of his unique personal resources in meeting the daily demands of teaching.

It must be pointed out here that the self-evaluation and self-direction phases require as prerequisites a substantial degree of knowledge of the structure of formal education, i.e., of the place of education in America, the lines of authority within a school system, the limitations of school facilities and the general duties and responsibilities of the teacher for his pupils.

New Directions in Education

The second major reason for including a concern for the teacher-as-a-person in our program is dictated by the currently changing structure of the American educational system.

In 1962, Stolurow stated that, "The school system as we know it is intimately tied to the concept of group instruction and a lock-step development and progression of students during their formative years. If it were to be shown that individualized instruction is effective and economically possible, then the implications for social change in the schools would be significant." (in DeCecco, p. 349)

Stolurow was talking about the movement for individualizing instruction via programed materials such as programed texts and teaching machines. Corey (NSSE Yearbook, 1967) remarked that by 1965 there was an apparent wane in interest by psychologists in this subject, at least as evidenced by a decline in the number of articles written about it. It appears, however, that rather than a lack of interest in individualizing instruction there has been a shift of focus on the appropriate means for accomplishing individualization. That focus now appears to be on computer based instructional techniques--as witness the 393-item bibliography in Bushnell's The Computer in Education (1967); approximately one-third of the entries in this list are dated 1965 or later.

This movement toward individualization and automation means that the information we give to the teacher-trainee today about the school system and his duties--information upon which he relies for evaluation of his success as a teacher--may very well be obsolete tomorrow. Then he will need to make a new self-evaluation and new plans for meeting his changing obligations.

More importantly these recent trends mean that if our teacher education programs continue to concentrate solely on instructional techniques, we can be sure now that many teachers will be ill prepared for their roles. For it is the instructional duties specifically that researchers have found can often be handled (sometimes better handled) by machines.

As is pointed out in the introduction to the Sixty-sixth Yearbook of NSSE (p. 3), "...instruction is a special kind of teaching that has specificity of purpose and an orderliness that does not characterize all teaching. Teaching and instruction and learning are clearly not interchangeable concepts...."

Corey (ibid. p. 6) clarifies the distinction between teaching, learning and instruction by stating that, "...we are defining instruction operationally as the 'process whereby the environment of an individual is deliberately manipulated to enable him to learn to omit or engage in specified behaviors under specified conditions or as responses to specified situations."

"Instruction tous is the process whereby the behaviors described by those who plan a curriculum are taught...." (p. 10)

For example, once it is decided that students should learn to add, subtract, multiply and divide, instruction is the process of transmitting the information and principles of these mathematical operations and arranging a test in order to observe the students' facility in the required manipulative behavior.

It might appear to some that the whole of the job of the teacher is instruction, but that is a naive view. We have already seen that the teacher, particularly at the elementary level, has the responsibility for the personal and social development of students. There is no evidence that the machine is ready to take over individualization in this sphere. The more machines that are brought into the educational system, the more the teacher will be free to take on the more complex problems that only human understanding and empathy can solve.

It appears to me that more and more a successful teacher is one who must know himself--one who elects teaching because his own highest purpose and goals are met in the process of assisting students to clarify and attain their own best potential. I ask for a model teacher education program that attends specifically to the conditions requisite to achieving a total individualization of education.